

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-2 and 4-14 are pending in the application, with 1 and 8 being the independent claims. Claims 1 and 8 are sought to be amended. Claim 15 is sought to be cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested. Unless otherwise indicated, the claim amendments are for purposes of clarity and not to overcome any rejection in the Office Action.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-2 and 4-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. Sec. 102(b) as being anticipated by Vierthaler et al. Claim 15 has been cancelled, therefore rendering its rejection moot. Applicant traverses the rejection of claim 1-2 and 4-14 because the cited reference fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all the features of the claimed invention.

For example, the cited reference (Vierthaler) fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a broadcast television system committee (BTSC) decoder including an I/F demodulator having a scalable output, as recited in Applicant's claim 1 and 8. These features are taught, for example, in Applicant's specification in paragraph 0028.

By contrast, Vierthaler seems to be completely silent regarding any teaching concerning an I/F demodulator having a scalable output. In Applicant's novel and non-

obvious technique, the scalability of the output facilitates signal level adjustments to ensure compatibility of the I/F demodulator with different downstream DSP devices.

It is respectfully pointed out that anticipation can only be established by a single prior art reference that discloses each and every element of the claimed invention. RCA Corp. v. Applied Digital Data Systems, Inc., 730 F.2d 1440 (Fed. Cir. 1984). Therefore, since the cited reference fails to recite each and every element recited in claims 1 and 8, claims 1 and 8 are not anticipated by the cited reference and are therefore allowable. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 8 are therefore, respectfully requested.

Claims 2 and 4-7 depend from claim 1 and claims 9-14 depend from claim 8. Therefore, claims 2, 4-7, and 9-14 are allowable at least for the reasons claims 1 and 8 are allowable, and for the specific features recited therein.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Theodore A. Wood
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 52,374

Date: June 29, 2007

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

693141_1.DOC